

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration in view of the previous amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-34 are pending. By this Amendment claims 1, 2, 4-16 are canceled and new claims 17-34 are added.

Applicants' new claim 17 is directed to a printing control device. A printer-specific information storage unit stores printer-specific information which identifies a printer. The printer-specific information includes at least one of a name, a specific ID, a former IP address, and a network port of the printer. A search unit locates a printer connected to a network and obtains printer-specific information from the printer connected to the network. A comparing unit compares the printer-specific information for the located printer obtained by the search unit with the printer-specific information of a particular printer stored in the printer-specific information storage unit and determines if the located printer is the particular printer. When the comparing unit determines that the located printer is the particular printer, an update unit obtains new printer-specific information about the located printer searched for by the search unit and updates corresponding information stored in the printer-specific information storage unit to the new printer-specific information.

In a non-limiting example described in Applicant's specification, when an IP address of a printer has been changed, the printer with the changed IP address is searched for over the network based on printer-specific information such as for example a name, a specific ID, a former IP address, and/or a network port number of the printer. The new IP address is obtained and updated.

The June 4, 2009 Office Action rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0005097 to Barnard et al.; rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-12, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Barnard in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,544 to Katagiri; rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Barnard; and rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Barnard in view of Katagiri and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,514 to Machida. These rejections are moot.

As disclosed in Barnard at paragraph [0038], DHCP server 75 allows network management device 20 to assign IP addresses to a plurality of printing devices. The DHCP server assigns an IP address to a printing device on network 10 and then receives an address acknowledgement message from the printing device. The discovery module 84 is used to perform discovery on detected printing devices on network 10 to obtain information regarding printing device network settings and functional capabilities. Alternatively, the discovery module uses broadcast discovery message pinging through a list of IP addresses.

If a network printing device is assigned a new IP address, the discovery module 84 is notified and provided with the IP address assigned to the printer and the MAC address of the printer. The discovery module compares the MAC address of the printer with those listed in the entries of a device management directory 70. An entry is found under the MAC address of the printer 18 together with its previous IP address. Using the MAC and IP address, the print queue service module 83 can identify a previously created print queue associated with the printer. The IP address is updated to reflect the newly assigned IP address.

However, none of these portions of Barnard disclose a storage unit that stores printer-specific information which identifies a printer and includes a name, a specific ID, a former IP address, and a network port of a printer and an information obtaining unit obtaining printer-specific information from a printer connected to a network. For example, the previous IP address used in Barnard as described above is not obtained from a printer connected to a network. Instead, it is contained in the entry of a device management directory 70. Further, it is not compared with information obtained from a printer and used to search for a printer having identical information. Thus, Applicant's new independent claim 17 is distinguishable over the Barnard reference.

New independent claims 23 and 29 are distinguishable over Barnard for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 17.

The dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above as well as for the individual features they recite.

The Katagiri and Machida references do not overcome the deficiencies of Barnard noted above.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 30, 2009

By:


Michael Britton
Registration No. 47,260

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620